UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,705 11/21/2003 Vadim Sheinin		YOR920030561US1 (17147)	2960	
	7590 06/30/200 FT MURPHY & PRES	EXAMINER		
400 GARDEN		BLOOM, NATHAN J		
SUITE 300 GARDEN CITY, NY 11530			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,	2624		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

<b>Application No.</b> 10/719,705		Applicant(s)	
		SHEININ, VADIM	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NATHAN BLOOM	2624	

		14/11/// BESSI	
The MAILING DATE of	this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>03 June 2008</u> F	AILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.
application, applicant must tim application in condition for allo	nely file one of the following opwance; (2) a Notice of Appe	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav	Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this it, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request within one of the following time
a) The period for reply expires	months from the mailing	date of the final rejection.	
no event, however, will the st Examiner Note: If box 1 is ch	atutory period for reply expire la ecked, check either box (a) or (	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	in the final rejection, whichever is later. In g date of the final rejection.  FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained und have been filed is the date for purposes under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from	of determining the period of ext (1) the expiration date of the seply received by the Office later	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	36(a) and the appropriate extension fee of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as te of the final rejection, even if timely filed,
	d on . A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37	CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter		avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
· · · ·	hat would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of r (c) ☐ They are not deemed to appeal; and/or	•	· ·	ducing or simplifying the issues for
(d) They present additional NOTE: (See 3)	7 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	
		21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcor			
non-allowable claim(s).	· · · ——	·	timely filed amendment canceling the  Il be entered and an explanation of
how the new or amended clair The status of the claim(s) is (c Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-23. Claim(s) withdrawn from cons	ms would be rejected is prov or will be) as follows:		in be entered and an explanation of
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence because applicant failed to pro was not earlier presented. Se</li> </ol>	ovide a showing of good and		otice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered it or other evidence is necessary and
	or other evidence failed to o		al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATI		n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsiderat		t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Informatio 13. ☑ Other: See Continuation She		(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
		/Brian Q Le/	
		Primary Examiner, Art U	Jnit 2624

Continuation of 13. Other: The amendments require further search and consideration since they introduce limitations not previously claimed. Furthermore, the arguments are not convicing since they are directed to the claims proposed and not entered, and not the finally rejected claims.